



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,097	06/30/2003	Hung-Yu Kuo	TOP 295	8098
23995	7590	04/18/2006		
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER RIAD, AMINE	
			ART UNIT 2113	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/608,097	KUO, HUNG-YU	
	Examiner Amine Riad	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 6/30/2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *AF*
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **Detailed Action**

Claims 1-20 have presented for examination.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 5 recites "when CPU is switched to debugging mode, reading the first BIOS code from the ROM by the debugging system through the second bridge". The specification does not support this claimed limitation. The specification instead states that when the CPU is in debugging mode the CPU reads the BIOS code from the debugging system, not from the ROM (Page 2; paragraph 24 "it is noted that the data request for BIOS code is routed to the debugging system when the CPU 10 is switched to debugging mode"). Nowhere, the specification describes that the debugging system reads from the ROM.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8,11-13, 15-16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson US Patent 6,003,130.

In regard to claims 1, and 11 Anderson discloses:

- method of initializing a computer system equipped with a debugging system (Figure 2; item 33),
- the computer system has a CPU (Figure 2; item 12), a local bus (Figure 2; item 16), peripheral bus (Figure 2; item 60 and 70) and expansion bus (Figure 2; item 72), a first (Figure 2; item 14 “ the system controller 14 also connects the CPU bus 16 to a PCI bus 60”) and second bridge (Figure 2; item 30), and a ROM coupled to the expansion bus and storing a first BIOS code (Figure 2; item 80),

the debugging system is coupled to the peripheral bus, the method comprising the steps of:

- operating the CPU in a normal mode wherein first data requests directed to the ROM are routed to the local bus by the CPU; (Figure 3; item 92)[“CPU 12

executes a startup routine that is also stored in the EEPROM 80 along with the BIOS program" step 92 defines normal mode]

- operating the CPU in a debugging mode wherein second data requests directed to the debugging system are routed to the local bus by the CPU; (Figure 3; item 102) [initiate crisis recovery procedure defines debugging mode]
- Transferring one of the data requests from the local bus to the peripheral bus via the first bridge. (Column 4; line 34-36 [when CPU executes the star up routine stored in item 80 it has to transit by the item 14 (first bridge) to request data. First bridge is located between local and peripheral bus])
- responding via the second bridge to the first data requests on the peripheral bus with the first BIOS code stored in ROM to be loaded in the CPU; (Column 4; line 50-51)[CPU 12 reads data from EEPROM 80 through item 30 which is second bridge]
- and responding via the debugging system to the second data requests on the peripheral bus with the second BIOS code stored therein to be loaded in the CPU. (Column 4;line 60-65)[User installs a disk containing proper BIOS program on the floppy disk drive is defined as responding via debugging system to second data request]

In regard to claims 2, and12 Anderson discloses:

- method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second BIOS code is programmed by the debugging system. (Column 3; line 13-15) [Since disk containing the correct BIOS is inserted to item 33 considered in parent claim 1 as part of debugging system, this implies that second BIOS code is programmed by item 33]

In regard to claims 3, and 13 Anderson discloses:

- method as claimed in claim 2, wherein the debugging system comprises: an interface card coupled to the peripheral bus; (Figure 2; item 33)
- and a second computer system coupled to the interface card. (Figure 2; item 24)[Item 24 is network card that is coupled to item 33. Item 24 has the capability to connect to other computer system. Consequently all computer system connected to item 24 would be coupled to item 33]

In regard to claims 5, and 15 Anderson discloses:

method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising the step of:

- when the CPU is switched to debugging mode, reading the first BIOS code from the ROM by the debugging system through the second bridge.(Figure 2; first BIOS is stored in item 80. In order for CPU 12 to read BIOS from item 80, BIOS has to transit by item 30 considered as second bridge)

In regard to claims 6, and 16 Anderson discloses:

method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising the step of:

- when the CPU is switched to debugging mode, overwriting the first BIOS code in the ROM with the second BIOS code by the debugging system through the second bridge.(Figure 2; second BIOS comes from item 33. In order for CPU to override first BIOS it has to read it from item 30 which in turn has to transit by item 30 considered as second bridge)

In regard to claims 8, and 18

Anderson discloses:

- method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the peripheral and expansion bus are a PCI and an ISA bus, (Column 4; line 14)
- and first and second bridge are a north and south bridge respectively (Figure 2; item 14 north bridge and item 30 south bridge)

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson US Patent 6,003,130 in view of Hurd US Patent 6,553,502.

In regard to claims 4, and 14

Anderson discloses initializing a computer system equipped with debugging system.

Anderson does not disclose retrieving and displaying contents of registers.

Hurd teaches retrieving and displaying contents of registers. (Column 10; line 64-65)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of retrieving and displaying register content, as taught by Hurd, into the computer system equipped with debugging system of Anderson. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because displaying the content of registers would better assist the user and makes the debugging process faster, and more efficient.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson US Patent 6,003,130 in view of Crump US Patent 5,898,843.

In regard to claims 7, and 17

Anderson discloses initializing computer system equipped with debugging system.

Anderson does not disclose an A20 CPU gate switching between normal and debugging mode.

Crump teaches switching between normal and debugging mode by using A20 gate (Column 17; line 41)[on is normal off is debugging]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of switching from normal mode to debugging mode using an A20 gate, as taught by Crump, into the computer system equipped with debugging system of Anderson. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because A20 gate offers high switching speed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9,10,19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson US Patent 6,003,130 in view of Wong US Patent 6,240,480.

In regard to claims 9, and 19

Anderson discloses initializing computer system equipped with debugging system and retrieving first BIOS code in ROM.

Anderson does not disclose that second bridge responds by decoding address carried in data request.

Wong teaches that a bridge may be equipped to decode addresses (Column 4; line 64) and (Column 5; line 1-3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of decoding addresses by second bridge, as taught by Wong, into computer system equipped with debugging system of Anderson. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because decoding addresses at the bridge level would offer a faster recovery to the system.

In regard to claims 10, and 20

Anderson discloses initializing computer system equipped with debugging system and retrieving second BIOS code.

Anderson does not disclose that second bridge responds by decoding address carried in data request.

Wong teaches that a bridge may be equipped to decode addresses (Column 4; line 64) and (Column 5; line 1-3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of decoding addresses by second bridge, as taught by Wong, into computer system equipped with debugging system of Anderson. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because decoding addresses at the bridge level would offer a faster recovery to the system.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S patent 6,34,873 teaches most of the limitations, but lacks switching

modes, on the other hand U.S. patent 5,805,882 contains some elements, but lacks important element, which are first and second bridge. See PTO 892.

## Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amine Riad whose telephone number is 571-272-8185. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR  
Patent Examiner

  
ROBERT E. BEAUSOUIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TELEFAX (703) 272-8300